

*Positive Peace Fostered by a Divergent Religious Nonprofit:
Mennonite Central Committee's Pragmatic Application of Anabaptist Pacifism*

An Honors Thesis (HONR 499)

by

Katrina Pieri

Thesis Advisor

Gerald Waite

**Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana**

January, 2015

Expected Date of Graduation

May, 2015

Understand
The
LD
2489
24
2015
F54

Abstract

Within the field of faith-based nonprofits, the Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) is a unique organization due to its use of peacebuilding strategies which attempt to foster sustainable, positive peace. MCC self-ascribes as an organization dedicated to relief, development, and peace in the name of Christianity, and is also a part of a worldwide ministry of Anabaptist churches. Contextualizing MCC's faith-based vision within the history of Anabaptism reveals that, in contrast to the Anabaptist tradition of noninvolvement, MCC has shaped and re-envisioned the Anabaptist vision of peace to include social action. An analysis of the organization also reveals that MCC's peacebuilding strategies are necessarily informed by Anabaptism but also demonstrate a pragmatic application of the tenets of pacifism in nonprofit work, making MCC divergent from other faith-based nonprofits that focus on proselytizing or provide temporary, externally imposed solutions in areas of conflict.

Acknowledgements

I would like to Zenebe Abebe, Executive Director at the MCC Great Lakes office in Goshen, IN, for providing me with the opportunity to participate in an insightful, educational internship with MCC in the summer of 2014. Under his guidance, in addition to the guidance of other staff members at the Great Lakes office, I worked on a number of peace-oriented projects that deepened my convictions regarding peace and broadened my perspectives.

I must also thank my parents, Linda and Charles Pieri, for their lasting commitment to peace, which I witnessed growing up and which has always inspired me to continue their legacy of peacemaking.

Finally, I would like to thank Mr. Gerald Waite, Research Fellow of the Center for Peace and Conflict Studies, for serving as my thesis advisor. Throughout the course of this project, he helpfully critiqued my work and provided valuable feedback that enabled me to put forth my best work. Without his help, I would not have been able to successfully incorporate research and my own analysis into one cohesive written paper.

Table of Contents

Introduction	5
Part I: MCC's Anabaptist Vision and Other Faith-Based NGOs	15
Part II: MCC's Peacebuilding Strategies	22
Conclusions	29
Notes	33
Bibliography	36

Introduction

The Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) is not particularly well-known within the vast community of nonprofits, and yet its unique qualities set it apart from other such organizations. MCC identifies as belonging to the Anabaptist tradition, and therefore subscribes to the tenets of pacifism. Because of its unique faith-based approach, MCC deserves close examination and analysis within the field of peace studies. As an organization, MCC has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to the building of positive peace, which is particularly significant given the tendency of some nonprofit organizations to fail to identify and resolve underlying structural problems in areas of conflict. Such a failure may in turn prevent the actualization of lasting peace. The focus of this thesis can therefore be succinctly stated in the following questions: How is the Mennonite Central Committee's work toward building positive peace informed by the Anabaptist tradition, and how does this work demonstrate a pragmatic and successful application of Anabaptist pacifist ideology in the nonprofit sector? Additionally, how does the re-imagined Anabaptist vision that guides MCC's work help distinguish it from other faith-based nonprofit organizations?

The concept of peace is often expressed in simplistic terms, and thus, peace is described as the absence of war. Claims are made that war is fought to achieve peace, or that the end of war signals the beginning of peace. Implicit in such a narrow conceptualization of peace, however, is a failure to identify its complexities. While the far-reaching and complex effects of war are often vocalized, the same cannot often be said for peace. As noted by Anderson, "Virtually all Western language definitions emphasize the absence of war and other forms of overt violence as a key component of peace."¹ Such a colloquial definition of peace, however, fails to reveal a full

understanding of the concept. Peace, as most scholars would assert, consists of much more than the mere absence of war.

Numerous definitions of peace, some related but all usually differing slightly in content, exist within the literature. Anderson defines peace as “a condition in which individuals, families, groups, communities, and/or nations experience low levels of violence and engage in mutually harmonious relationships.”² Such a definition implies the elimination of factors that fall under the category of violence in addition to the creation of positive institutions and conditions that lead to peace.³ Stated otherwise, true peace involves “transcending the conditions that limit human potential and assuring opportunities for self-realization.”⁴ Or, as stated by Pilisuk and Nagler, peace includes “both the absence of unnecessary violence and the pursuit of a world that offers deep contentment with the process of life.”⁵ Such definitions of peace, despite their differences, recognize two important, intrinsically related concepts: negative peace and positive peace. Unlike the colloquial definition of peace, positive peace emphasizes the effort to eliminate forms of structural violence, which have “the effect of denying people important rights such as economic opportunity, social and political equality, a sense of fulfillment and self-worth, and access to a healthy natural environment.”⁶ Thus, such factors as impoverishment, deprivation, humiliation, political repression, the denial of self-determination, and a lack of human rights all qualify as forms of structural violence.⁷

As recognized in the definitions of peace stated by Anderson, Cortright, and Pilisuk and Nagler, to eliminate war and other forms of violence is to achieve negative peace, but until forms of structural violence are eliminated, a country, culture or community cannot begin to build positive peace. If a country is free of war and yet continues to suffer from extreme poverty, for example, it is unlikely that the country is engaged in the process of building positive peace.

Various forms of structural violence may create the conditions that foment war, so it is easy to imagine how a country enjoying negative peace may still be susceptible to further literal violence and war. With this in mind, it is obvious that any individual or organization hoping to build peace must examine not only the literal forms of violence suffered by humans, but the various injustices preventing the creation of positive peace.

Peace has been conceptualized in different ways not only by scholars, but by cultures and religious groups. Of particular importance to a discussion of MCC is the concept of pacifism, which, according to Cortright, “entered the lexicon at the beginning of the twentieth century as a general term to describe the stance of those opposed to war.”⁸ When Emile Arnaud of France initially coined the term, it was meant to represent not only a commitment to nonviolence, but a call to social action as well.⁹ In this manner, the term was meant to illustrate a break with the form of nonresistance practiced by traditional peace communities, such as the Amish, Mennonites, and Quakers, among others. Nonresistance refers to an earlier, “more specific tradition of religiously based refusal to condone or participate in war in any form.”¹⁰ Those religious communities with a tradition of nonresistance, unlike the new “pacifists” of the early twentieth century, often maintained a commitment to separation from the state and noninvolvement with the world outside of the religious community. Thus, the component of social action added by the early pacifists did indeed differ from the traditional peace communities’ conceptualizations of peace.

Unfortunately, the term “pacifism” caused a good deal of confusion within the larger community of peace activists due to its vague definition. Ironically, pacifism eventually became synonymous with the earlier tradition of nonresistance, despite Arnaud’s original conception of pacifism as including social action.¹¹ The term “pacifism,” which was not even part of the

vocabulary of the early historic peace communities, is therefore used today to describe those very communities, many of whom still maintain noninvolvement with the state and separation from the modern world. Today, these communities may self-ascribe as “pacifist” and explain their histories of nonresistance in pacifist language. Academics and others within the broader peace community, on the other hand, often prefer not to use the confusing label of “pacifism.” It is often viewed as idealistic, impractical, or altogether too vaguely defined.

It is worthwhile to examine the history of nonresistance within Christianity, which today might be called the history of pacifism, in order to contextualize the Anabaptist beliefs to which the Mennonite Central Committee adheres. For the sake of clarity, the word “pacifism” will be used throughout the rest of this paper as it was adopted by the historic peace communities, as opposed to Arnaud’s initial conceptualization of the term. Pacifism, or a refusal to participate in or condone war or other forms of violence, has existed within Christianity since the time of the followers of the early Christian movement after the death of Jesus Christ. Various movements or communities of Christians adopted this pacifist stance, but perhaps the most notable commitment to pacifism within Christianity appeared within the Protestant Reformation spawned by Martin Luther’s 95 Theses. In German-speaking Switzerland, the Anabaptists rose to reclaim the pacifist heritage of the early Christian movement. In 1525, they broke with the Reformation leader Ulrich Zwingli, who shared Luther’s commitment to church reform and reliance on scripture. Zwingli simply “would not go as far as they wanted on such issues as a complete ban on violence,”¹² and so the Anabaptists began their evolution as a distinct group of pacifists. The Anabaptists agreed with their fellow reformers on many points, such as the belief that salvation is achieved through faith, and not through sacraments or works of penance, and that the final authority is the Bible.¹³ And yet, the major points on which they differed clearly set them apart.

The Anabaptists “renounced the violence of the Peasant’s War, and they rejected the long-standing assumptions of Christendom—unchallenged by Luther and the other reformers—that aligned the church firmly with the state.”¹⁴ Roth notes the following about the various groups of Anabaptists that evolved:

[They] adopted an ethic that precluded Christian participation in warfare or lethal violence. As a result of these convictions, Anabaptist groups generally took on a cultural form that was in tension with the surrounding culture.¹⁵

In 1527, a group of Anabaptists traveled to Schleithem, outside of Zurich, and under the leadership of the former Benedictine abbot Michael Sattler, they agreed on the basic principles of their faith.¹⁶ The Schleithem Confession notably recognized that Anabaptists must treat all humans, including enemies, with love. Sattler, however, did not live to enjoy this expression of Anabaptist unity. He was captured, tried, and sentenced to have his body torn apart and burned—he suffered a martyr’s death. Sattler’s gruesome death, unfortunately, was one among many. Following his execution, the Anabaptists lost their cohesion once more, and they became a scattered, hidden church.

The Anabaptists occupied a precarious position: because they strongly renounced violence, when even Luther accepted warfare, and called for such things as an end to infant baptisms—hence their name, Anabaptists, which meant re-baptizers—they presented a threat to both the Reformation and the Catholic Church. The Anabaptists faced persistent persecution or isolation from these two groups with whom they were at odds. As noted by Pennypacker, “The Zwinglian, the Lutheran and the Calvinistic churches, as well as the Roman Catholic Church participated with a number of the states in efforts to destroy the Anabaptists.”¹⁷ Indeed, “refusal

to bear arms was interpreted as an act hostile to the government.”¹⁸ During the sixteenth century, at least two thousand Anabaptists were executed, while thousands more were exiled, imprisoned, and tortured.¹⁹ Anabaptist men, women, and even children across Europe were drowned, burned, or put to the sword.²⁰ Between 1525 and 1800, over two hundred decrees were issued by European governments denouncing the Anabaptists for their belief in adult baptism, refusal to bear arms, and refusal to swear oaths, the last of which essentially equated to a rejection of war in the Middle Ages.²¹ Although they were often killed for their beliefs, the Anabaptists were also driven out of towns, creating a pattern of repeated exile.²² The Anabaptists, like the early members of the Christian movement far before them, were seen as dangerous enemies of the state, which necessitated the continuation of persecution. Nonetheless, the Anabaptist movement spread throughout parts of Europe.

Although the Anabaptists generally agreed on the importance of nonviolence, as it was presented in the biblical teachings of Jesus Christ, at times they still continued to suffer from a lack of cohesion. Some Anabaptists thought they were living in the End Times, and thus “prophesied in the name of God that the time for turning the other cheek had passed.”²³ From 1534-1535, a small group of Dutch Anabaptists in the city of Munster demonstrated the lesson that to participate in acts of violence is to forfeit victory for pacifism. These overtly radical pacifists took up arms in an attempt to establish their own form of government in the city, which ended with “hundreds of people dead and thousands more deeply disillusioned.”²⁴ Their efforts contradicted the core nonviolent beliefs of Anabaptism and only ended in death and destruction; by taking up arms, they did not further the cause of the movement. The tragedy at Munster settled the question of violence definitively, and the Anabaptists “came to agreement that in questions of discipleship, the words and the example of Jesus were final, and could not be set

aside until Jesus himself set them aside.”²⁵ The Anabaptists decided that they would not return evil for evil; instead, they would respond to evil with good.²⁶

It was also out of the aftermath of Munster that cohesion and unity rose among the Anabaptists once more. A new group of Anabaptists, led by Menno Simons, a Catholic priest turned into a radical reformer, revisited the foundational teachings of nonviolence that had originally factored into the Anabaptists’ decision to break from the larger Protestant Reformation. As noted by Roth, “violence at Munster had also convinced Menno of the profound danger of confusing Christian convictions with the power of the sword.”²⁷ Menno Simons very clearly opposed the “doings of the fanatical Anabaptists at Munster.”²⁸ As noted by Menno Simons:

The Prince of Peace is Jesus Christ... We who were formerly no people at all, and who knew of no peace, are now called to be... a church... of peace. True Christians do not know vengeance. They are the children of peace. Their hearts overflow with peace. Their mouths speak peace, and they walk in the way of peace.²⁹

This small group of Anabaptists evolved into the Mennonites, who would continue to promote the peace of Christ into the 21st century.

Groups of Mennonites populated North America starting in the late 1600s. While many of their Anabaptist brethren, such as the Amish and the Hutterites, continued the Anabaptist tradition of separation from the world, some of the Mennonites chose to journey down a different path that would result in direct involvement outside of the Mennonite community. This kind of commitment to social action was certainly not accepted by all within the Mennonite communities of North America, but it was adopted by at least one organization, the Mennonite Central

Committee, and MCC has continued to shape the identity of the Mennonite community at large. MCC serves as an example of an organization that is committed to pacifist ideology (given their continuation of the Anabaptist tradition) and specifically works to build positive peace.

MCC self-ascribes as an organization committed to relief, development, and peace in the name of Christ. The organization further self-ascribes as a “a worldwide ministry of Anabaptist churches, [that] shares God’s love and compassion for all in the name of Christ by responding to basic human needs and working for peace and justice.”³⁰ Operating both internationally and domestically, MCC had personnel in 48 countries and helped provide food assistance and/or material resources to 23 countries from April 2012 through March 2013.³¹ Material resources shipped to areas in need included such items or packages as AIDS caregiver kits, hygiene kits, infant care kits, relief kits, school kits, sewing kits, and blankets and comforters.³² The majority of MCC’s funding comes from individual donors and churches, but thrift shops, the revenue from annual relief sales, grants, and other sources also fund their work. Although MCC maintains paid employees in main and regional offices throughout North America, and also pays for MCC personnel to live and work at various job sites around the world under multiple-year commitments, unpaid volunteers provide a vast amount of labor for the organization. They volunteer their time at thrift shops, sorting donated items and putting them out on the floors of the shops, package relief kits in material resource centers, sew quilts to send overseas, help package meat to send as food assistance to areas in need, and help organize and run relief sales.

The work of MCC, despite the historic Mennonite tradition of noninvolvement, clearly demonstrates the meaning of pacifism as first outlined by Arnaud. As noted by Sampson, the origins of MCC can be traced back to the dire of needs of Mennonites in Russia in the 1920s.³³ These Russian Mennonites, unlike their counterparts in North America, were “starving as a result

of the turmoil and revolution there.”³⁴ In order to respond effectively to the needs of the Russian Mennonites, the Mennonites spread across North America, in both the United States and Canada, collectively created a new inter-Mennonite agency, the Mennonite Central Committee.”³⁵ The Mennonite Central Committee gained permission to legally function in the Soviet Union due to skillful lobbying, and by 1924, MCC had distributed over a million dollars in aid, including tractors and horses. It is estimated that MCC saved the lives of around 9,000 Russian Mennonites in the process.³⁶ Unlike other religious nonprofits, MCC, from its conception, was focused on relief, development, and peace, as opposed to only Christian evangelism and related traditional missionary work.

Although MCC today exemplifies successful relief, development, and peace work, it may be hard to explain such success based on the somewhat unusual structure of the organization. As noted by J. Lorne Peachey, “Mennonite Central Committee really shouldn’t work. It’s an organization of paradoxes and ambiguities, one I suspect some management consultant might have shut down long ago.”³⁷ And yet, MCC does work as an organization, due to the following factors listed by Peachey:

First, because Anabaptists feel deeply that their faith must be put into action. Second, in spite of what appears to be a complicated structure, MCC works because it is a grassroots-oriented organization that is responsive to its stakeholders’ desires and interests. Finally, MCC works because it benefits from the collective efforts in relief and development of a diverse group of Amish, Brethren in Christ, and Mennonites.³⁸

MCC does indeed serve as an unusual example of a religious nonprofit, especially given its complex structure and reliance on volunteers. The success of the organization as a nonprofit

that utilizes pacifist ideology in its work is, in some ways, remarkable, but it also deserves specific attention within the field of peace studies due to its focus on positive peace. Gleditsch, Nordkvelle and Strand outline the consistent focus within peace research on negative peace, concluding that “To some extent, peace research has returned to its original agenda” of focusing on this aspect of peace.³⁹ It is for this reason that an organization such as MCC deserves close examination; based on the various branches of its work, it is clear that MCC’s overall goal is to build positive peace in affected areas, whether by placing MCC personnel in the area or by working with and supporting existing organizations that are native to the area and are already working on the ground. In the confusing quest to establish the meaning of “peace,” it is worthwhile to examine the success of a pacifist organization already working to build positive peace, the other side of the two-sided peace coin that does not receive as much academic attention as its counterpart, negative peace.

Part I: MCC's Anabaptist Vision and Other Faith-Based NGOs

MCC's peace-oriented work, while demonstrating a commitment to the present-day definition of "pacifism," does not correlate exactly with the historical tradition of Anabaptism. As noted above, MCC does not follow the traditional Anabaptist tenet of noninvolvement, and MCC's work instead demonstrates a true understanding of Arnaud's original conception of the term "pacifism," meaning that the organization's work also embodies a clear call to social action. The traditional Anabaptist stance of noninvolvement is not compatible with MCC's work, and yet MCC continues to identify as a Mennonite organization and, at a broader level, a ministry of Anabaptist churches dedicated to relief, development, and peace and justice. To understand this discrepancy, it is necessary to investigate how MCC has *shaped* and re-envisioned the Anabaptist vision among the general Mennonite community in North America, as opposed to solely being *shaped by* the Anabaptist tradition.

Tomomi's work investigating the relationship between religious beliefs and economic decisions among members of two Mennonite congregations in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania illustrates the discrepancy in modern Mennonite communities concerning the Anabaptist tenet of noninvolvement.⁴⁰ Tomomi further defines noninvolvement as the "Mennonite tenet of separation from the secular world, disengagement from practices and values that contradict their religious ideals."⁴¹ Tomomi's fieldwork suggests that the more conservative of the two congregations in Lancaster County emphasized separation from the world, which led members to seek jobs where they could work alongside fellow Mennonites, while members of the liberal congregation placed little emphasis on the religion of their co-workers and instead sought service-oriented jobs consistent with Mennonite values.⁴²

While Tomomi's study deals specifically with the correlation between Mennonite beliefs and economic occupation, the broader theme of discrepancy with the tenet of noninvolvement can also be applied to MCC's work. It is obvious that this work correlates more closely with the attitudes of the second congregation. During WWII, for example, MCC relief workers in war-torn countries "nurtured a mind to look beyond themselves," and others helped create a tradition of voluntary service.⁴³ As Marr states, from the post-war era all the way into the present, "MCC has promoted a global consciousness of justice among its constituents,"⁴⁴ and "MCC has become the epitome of the Anabaptist Vision."⁴⁵ As Mennonites began to participate in voluntary service, there was as a shift in the Anabaptist vision from an emphasis on nonconformity to an emphasis on reaching out to serve the world.⁴⁶ In Ontario, for example, MCC "is the result of a series of transitions that have transformed the way Ontario Mennonites have responded to their calling to peace and service."⁴⁷ Additionally, it is, in fact, the "Anabaptist understanding of discipleship, with its ethic of love," which "has provided the theological basis for service."⁴⁸ Anabaptism therefore informed the new focus on service, even if this service broke away from some aspects of traditional Anabaptism.

MCC successfully integrated a reimagined Anabaptist vision into its work, one which stems from the Anabaptist commitment to pacifism but moves beyond the tradition of noninvolvement to focus on service and social action. It was from this emphasis on service that MCC developed its mission of relief, development, and peace and justice in the name of Christ. The reimagining of the Anabaptist vision meant that MCC could practically apply the tenets of Anabaptism in its domestic and international work, thus demonstrating a pragmatic application of pacifist beliefs. It is worthwhile to examine, however, how religious orientation may affect the

overall structure of an organization such as MCC, which continues to be guided by its faith-based vision.

Scheitle's examination of the "parachurch" movement helps further explain and define MCC's role as a faith-based NGO. Scheitle discusses the "parachurch" sector, which consists of Christian organizations that exist "beyond the boundaries and authority of congregations and denominations."⁴⁹ MCC may be classified as belonging to such a "parachurch" movement, given its distinct religious affiliation with Anabaptism. The impacts of nonprofits within the parachurch movement move beyond the scope of religious communities, as the nonprofits "are engaging in issues that have social and political implications."⁵⁰ Here again, MCC aligns with these assertions, as their international and domestic work necessarily has social and political implications. Scheitle also asserts that the activities and teachings of the nonprofits within this sector "influence the ideas of their contributors and the people they interact with during their nonprofit activities."⁵¹ MCC has a broad range of influence within the Mennonite communities of North America, given its reliance to some extent on these communities for financial assistance and volunteers, and also given its status as a reputable organization that acts as an extension of the larger Anabaptist community. Finally, Scheitle asserts that "the rise of Christian nonprofits speaks to the adaptability of individuals and organizations to find outlets for their religious pursuits."⁵² This statement correlates with MCC's reimagining of the Anabaptist vision, and the application of this vision to their work. As stated above, the reimagining of this vision allowed MCC to focus its work on service, and eventually relief and development. The creation of the organization allowed Anabaptism to find a practical outlet, so that the beliefs of the tradition could be applied to the modern world.

Although MCC may be identified as belonging to Scheitle's "parachurch" movement, it is also necessary to investigate how MCC differs from other faith-based organizations, such as the other Christian nonprofits of the "parachurch" movement. MCC, for example, may exist within the same broad movement as evangelical Christian nonprofits, but the work of MCC differs to a great extent from evangelical nonprofits. In their study on the effects of variations in religious orientation on international relief and development organizations, Kniss and Campbell initially hypothesized that evangelical organizations would be more likely to focus on relief activities, while mainline Protestants and ecumenical organizations would be more likely to promote long-term sustainable development.⁵³ Their hypothesis was only partially supported, as nearly 60% of the evangelical organizations focused primarily on relief while around half of the liberal Protestant or ecumenical organizations focused on development. Additionally, evangelical organizations "were the least likely to use organizational and budgetary structures to sharply distinguish between religious extension and economic relief and development activities," while "more than 60% of the mainline Protestant and 80% of the ecumenical organizations showed clear differentiation."⁵⁴

Despite the length of time that has passed since this study was conducted, it is worthwhile to note that MCC appears to follow the kinds of patterns identified by Kniss and Campbell. MCC does not self-ascribe as an evangelical organization, and their three-part mission includes clearly separated relief and development components. MCC does, however, tend to emphasize the importance of their development programs. Volunteers who live in other areas of the world on long-term commitments, for example, are usually involved with long-term development initiatives, hence MCC's insistence that they live in the area for multiple years. Additionally, MCC clearly distinguishes between the type of work they are known for and the evangelical

missions of other faith-based organizations. MCC's reimagining of the Anabaptist vision can therefore be viewed as allowing the organization to stand alongside other non-evangelical, Protestant international relief and development organizations, while also ensuring that the tenets of Anabaptism continue to guide the organization's mission. The reimagined Anabaptist vision allowed for a more pragmatic application of the tenets of pacifism and also aligned MCC with the "liberal Protestant" organizations of Kniss and Campbell's study. MCC's faith-based vision guides the work of the organization, but this work differs from that of evangelical faith-based organizations which focus mainly on proselytizing and perhaps relief work.

In order to discuss the Mennonite Central Committee's role in building positive peace, it is also necessary to examine how and why other relief and development faith-based NGOs utilize peacebuilding strategies in their work. Although, as pointed out by Kniss and Campbell, some organizations focus more heavily on either relief or development, MCC demonstrates a commitment to both factors. Both of these factors, in turn, play a role in peacebuilding. As Gerstbauer explains, peacebuilding is often integrated into the relief and development work of these organizations, and may, for example, flow "naturally out of community development work."⁵⁵ Additionally, organizations may engage in more direct peace work through such activities as "peace education and training, mediation and dialogue, and advocacy work."⁵⁶ MCC's work may be viewed as involving all of these factors.

Gerstbauer also examines the factors that have influenced the decision of various nonprofits to include peacebuilding strategies in their work. As Gerstbauer states,

The typical story is that NGO peacebuilding was both (a) pushed by the messiness of the fall of the USSR and a rash of complex emergencies and conflicts that challenged the

“traditional” capacities of the state, and (b) became in vogue due to the recognition of the ties of humanitarianism with peace and security issues and encouragement (funding and otherwise) by official actors for NGOs to contribute to peacebuilding and democracy growth. There was a vacuum of power that NGOs rushed in to fill and NGOs were encouraged to engage in this new mandate.⁵⁷

These external factors may have indeed influenced various NGOs to incorporate peacebuilding strategies into their work, but “influential, external forces do not account for the whole story of why NGOs adopted peacebuilding mandates,” and such explanations also “fail to give adequate account to the maneuvering room within organizations themselves.”⁵⁸ Gerstbauer notes, for example, that MCC has revised its peacebuilding strategies over the years, first reaching beyond the Mennonite community and eventually reaching out into the international realm of nonprofit work. Thus, Gerstbauer hints at the reimagined Anabaptist vision mentioned earlier, which allowed MCC to demonstrate a successful application of pacifist beliefs in the world by incorporating evolving peacebuilding strategies into their work. It is clear that MCC’s peacebuilding strategies are primarily influenced by the Anabaptist vision that guides its work overall. As Gerstbauer notes, the religious grounding of the organization is clearly behind the adoption of peacebuilding.⁵⁹ Other similar faith-based nonprofits, such as World Vision and Catholic Relief Services, also demonstrate peacebuilding strategies that stem from their religious missions. In the case of Catholic Relief Services, for example, “it was precisely an effort to reinvigorate the Catholic identity of the organization that brought justice and peacebuilding to light.”⁶⁰ MCC therefore shares something of particular importance with other similar, faith-based NGOs: successful peacebuilding strategies are often incorporated by a nonprofit due to their

religious-oriented missions, and thus, these faith-based nonprofits are likely to be engaged in the building of positive peace.

Part II: MCC's Peacebuilding Strategies

Closer examination of MCC's work sheds light on the specific peacebuilding strategies utilized by the organization, which help build positive peace overall. Dicklitch and Rice, for example, discuss the strategies utilized by the organization during past work in Africa.⁶¹ Overall, these successful strategies helped ensure the organization's positive contributions toward development because they stemmed from sources within communities. As explained by Dicklitch and Rice,

Ultimately, international NGOs or donors can only do so much to promote development. Development, or at least the desire for it, must come from within...FBNs have a unique opportunity to harness a desire for development through their local faith communities, and also to ensure that the funds are used most appropriately.⁶²

This emphasis on promoting development from within a community is demonstrated in MCC's work and also reflects, once again, the Anabaptist background of MCC. As stated by Gopin, "Persecution for these beliefs has only made Mennonites better peacemakers: the memory of outsiders' attempts to change their own lives gives Mennonites the keen ability to respect other cultures and not presume to interfere in the lives of aid recipients."⁶³

According to Dicklitch and Rice, to successfully contribute to development that stems from internal efforts within communities, MCC first acknowledges short- and long-term goals. Recognizing the often chronic nature of certain types of conflict, MCC fieldworkers live in areas on multiple year commitments, and these fieldworkers engage in a "listen and learn approach" that "fosters a firm relationship between the MCC and local people."⁶⁴ In contrast, visiting experts from other international development agencies may "arrive in the middle of a conflict

and depart shortly thereafter.”⁶⁵ Additionally, MCC focuses on internal development work by working with grassroots civil society. MCC “does not seek to proselytize, although it works with mainly local faith-based organizations.”⁶⁶ In contrast to the traditional, faith-based missionary model of giving and proselytizing, “MCC does not provide handouts: instead it builds relationships to work alongside civil society in addressing local issues, so that local people are its partners, not its dependents.”⁶⁷ As an example of this type of grassroots involvement, MCC hires local staff in areas where the organization works, eventually passing on its own methods to the staff so that development will stem from an internal source within the community and persist even after MCC leaves the area. In early 1999, for example, “MCC’s last expatriate administrative assistant in West Africa left and was replaced by a Burkinabe citizen.”⁶⁸ Thus, it is obvious that MCC’s development work focuses on identifying short- and long-term concerns, hence the multiple-year assignments of fieldworkers, and also recognizes the importance of working at a grassroots level so that development stems from a source within a community. MCC also connects its programs with local existing structures and organizations in the area to “encourage long-term sustainability.”⁶⁹

MCC’s past work in Africa ranged from examples of direct involvement to examples of facilitation, depending on the needs of the community and the type of aid that MCC determined would be most effective in the situation. In 1998, for example, MCC “supported Somali women mobilizing other women from different clans to protest against the clan killings over natural resources in the northeast.”⁷⁰ Additionally, MCC’s presence in the Congo collaborated with a women’s organization that provided agricultural extension services in the Bandundu province, and in Nigeria, MCC partnered with the Christian Community Service of Nigeria to help provide funds for literacy classes and materials for women.⁷¹ In these cases, MCC’s involvement

demonstrated an understanding of the correlation between the empowerment of women and long-term community development. In Somalia in 1999, on the other hand, MCC acted as a facilitator and provided funds so that elders from warring clans could meet to negotiate.⁷² MCC then stepped aside instead of becoming further involved in the situation, empowering the local leaders to attempt to solve the conflicts instead of providing a temporary, externally-imposed solution. In doing so, MCC demonstrated that an effective peacebuilding strategy may necessitate that a nonprofit act only as a facilitator. Additionally, “not taking charge of the conflict”⁷³ may be one way in which MCC fieldworkers can respect the local culture, thus fostering deeper levels of trust and understanding between the workers and the community. Such trust and understanding can facilitate further empowerment of the local community in the long run.

Dicklitch and Rice further explain why MCC’s peacebuilding strategies are effective. Dicklitch and Rice identify MCC’s first factor of success as the organization’s focus on working directly with people. In Africa, for example, MCC has worked with local faith-based organizations, women’s groups, farmers’ cooperatives, and government agencies.⁷⁴ Additionally, as hinted at earlier, these community partners are “involved at all stages of decision making as equals, not as subordinates: the MCC does not ‘sub-contract’ other NGOs but seeks to be at one with the people with whom it is working.”⁷⁵ The second factor of success identified by Dicklitch and Rice involves accountability and legitimacy. By working closely with local organizations and community members, acting on questions of inappropriate or unsanctioned usage of funds, conducting regular program evaluations, and engaging in other vigilant activities, MCC ensures its accountability and legitimacy. Partner organizations are chosen carefully, and MCC volunteers are committed to multiple year assignments and paid only living expenses, emphasizing that they live alongside the constituency and try to teach by example.⁷⁶ Such factors

continue to reinforce MCC's legitimacy. Additionally, the small-scale nature of MCC's operations enables MCC to be vigilant against corruption, and because "the MCC is smaller and less dependent on external funds than many other NGOs, it can continue to respond to the grassroots rather than to donor priorities."⁷⁷ It is the success of these peacebuilding strategies which, in the long-run, promotes positive peace.

In addition to these factors of success, Dicklitch and Rice identify MCC's holistic approach, especially concerning development, as a factor of success. Although, as mentioned earlier, part of MCC's work focuses on relief and basic needs, the core mission involves social justice. MCC addresses needs such as subsistence and shelter, creates programs in such fields as education, health, agriculture, peace and justice, and helps with local job creation, but such work is implemented from the ground up. Additionally, MCC engages in lobbying governments and is not driven by specific timeframes. As Dicklitch and Rice note, "MCC is interested in empowerment, and in paving the way for greater social justice."⁷⁸ By taking all of these various factors into consideration, MCC addresses a complex web of structural forms of violence, which allows the organization to contribute to the building of sustainable, positive peace.

The aforementioned peacebuilding strategies are exemplified in MCC's work in various other regions and countries. In Central America, for example, MCC's permanent presence in the region dates back to 1976. Before this time, MCC "sent material aid and temporary relief workers to specific areas that had been damaged by hurricanes, earthquakes, or other natural disasters."⁷⁹ In addition to this kind of relief work, however, MCC soon attempted to partner with local organizations and churches, demonstrating the kind of grassroots involvement identified by Dicklitch and Rice. In 1985, MCC opened the Central American Peace Portfolio as the outgrowth of 10 years of service in the area. The Peace Portfolio gave MCC an

organizational structure for focusing and concentrating existing peacemaking efforts.⁸⁰

Additionally, the Peace Portfolio “offered the mechanism for making nonviolent alternatives known to groups and leaders working for social change, even if these groups continued to hold open the possibility of armed means of resolving conflict.”⁸¹ The Peace Portfolio embodied many of the factors of success in peacebuilding strategies outlined by Rice and Dicklitch, as noted in the following statement:

Rather than serve as “lone rangers” who ride into town one day, wipe out a conflict, and are gone the next, Peace Portfolio workers centered their work on a commitment to building long-term relationships with local peacemakers...Decisions were not made in isolation. What role to play emerged through persistent dialogue with trusted partners, at the invitation of those most directly involved in any given situation. More often than not, the role of the MCCer was one of supporting a front-line peacemaker.⁸²

Those involved with the Peace Portfolio worked directly with local people, partnered with local organizations and churches, and acted as facilitators or practiced direct involvement based on the circumstances of a given situation. These factors helped ensure that the Peace Portfolio contributed to long-term development, and thus the building of positive peace.

MCC’s past work in Somalia also demonstrates the peacebuilding factors identified by Dicklitch and Rice. In the 1990s in Somalia, MCC “sought to support a bottom-up approach to peacemaking wherever that was possible.”⁸³ This bottom-up strategy remained rooted in a Somali context, so it suggested that “national peace should be built on local and regional efforts at subclan deliberations and reconciliation.”⁸⁴ In a practical sense, this involved enhancing the role of elders, who traditionally have the responsibility to solve conflicts at local and regional

levels in Somali culture.⁸⁵ In this situation, MCC acted as a facilitator, helping finance peace conferences throughout the country. Funds were channeled through Somali NGO mechanisms, and these NGOs were usually ones with which MCC had worked on other projects. Continuing their role as facilitators, MCC personnel avoided playing any direct role in deliberations, allowing the Somali traditions to govern deliberations instead. Additionally, MCC attempted to provide education and raise awareness about the situation in Somalia, first within MCC's own constituency and then through dialogue with fellow relief agencies.⁸⁶

Lederach identifies several key principles guiding MCC's work, as illustrated by the specific situation in Somalia: 1) establish a comprehensive framework and integrated response; 2) be rooted in the context; 3) build relationships and understanding across the lines of conflict; and 4) articulate and advocate alternatives for nonviolent transformation that are consistent with our faith.⁸⁷ Within the first principle, Lederach also identifies the following sub-factors: 1) acknowledge and be explicit about the connections and dynamics among short- and long-term concerns; 2) acknowledge and be explicit about the levels of activity within a conflictive situation; and 3) acknowledge and be explicit about the connections between more traditional relief and development activities and conflict transformation and peacebuilding.⁸⁸ Finally, within the second principle, Lederach identifies the following sub-factors: 1) encourage and provide space for peacemaking approaches that emerge from within the setting; and 2) encourage and provide space for indigenous peacemakers.⁸⁹ While stated in other terms, these factors and sub-factors correlate with those factors of success identified by Dicklitch and Rice, suggesting continuity in MCC's work in different case studies. Lederach identifies the importance of recognizing short- and long-term concerns, which correlates with Dicklitch and Rice's focus on short- and long-term goals. Additionally, Lederach's second factor, which involves being rooted

in the context, correlates with Dicklitch and Rice's emphasis on grassroots involvement and development from within a community. The sub-factors listed by Lederach, involving spaces for indigenous peacemakers that are located within the setting, are especially indicative of this focus on solving conflict and fostering development from within a community, as opposed to imposing an externally-derived, temporary solution.

MCC's work in Northern Ireland in the 1980s also demonstrates some of the peacebuilding strategies outlined by Dicklitch and Rice. Instead of forming a new Mennonite community in the area, for example, MCC workers thought it wise to "support existing and emerging communities we [the MCC workers] were learning to know."⁹⁰ As Liechty states,

We would, if possible, support existing and emerging communities rather than take new initiative. Still more influential was thinking about the bridging role we increasingly understood as an important and distinctive offering. Were we to start even a small Mennonite community in heavily churchied Northern Ireland, we would immediately be regarded as competition, however limited, and our connecting, encouraging role would be hampered, if not impossible.⁹¹

This strategy emphasizes, once again, a clear focus on grassroots involvement, and an awareness of how a nonprofit's level of involvement in any given community must be evaluated based on a number of factors. Additionally, the MCC workers in Northern Ireland identified the "importance of long-term commitment."⁹² The political situation and level of violence in Northern Ireland contributed to the workers' understanding of the deep-rooted, long-term conflict, and the corresponding long-term commitment that would be needed in the area.

Conclusions

In their examination of high-impact nonprofits, Crutchfield and Grant identify six common factors of success, most of which are demonstrated by MCC and help explain and define the organization's success as a faith-based nonprofit. First, Crutchfield and Grant identify that high-impact nonprofits both advocate and serve.⁹³ MCC's work clearly demonstrates a propensity to serve in different capacities depending on the situation in question, but MCC also maintains advocacy offices in Ottawa and Washington as well as in the United Nations. MCC's general advocacy work may involve: 1) Analyzing policies from an Anabaptist perspective; 2) Meeting with legislators and diplomats; 3) Petitions and letter-writing campaigns; and 4) Praying for government officials.⁹⁴ Additionally, MCC's work aligns with the third factor identified by Crutchfield and Grant, which is to inspire evangelists, or "see volunteers, donors, and advisers not only for what they can contribute to the organization in terms of time, money, and guidance but also for what they can do as evangelists for their cause."⁹⁵ MCC's basis in the Anabaptist faith seemingly ensures that its vast network of volunteers contribute to the organization due to their faith-based or otherwise compassionate beliefs. MCC's volunteers are often unpaid, or paid only enough to cover basic living expenses depending on the assignment and location, and yet they are presumably inspired to dedicate their time and energy to a cause they find worthy.

MCC also demonstrates an understanding of the fourth factor listed by Crutchfield and Grant, which is to nurture nonprofit networks. As stated above, MCC often partners with local nonprofits or similar locally-based organizations in the community where MCC personnel are working. In a given area, MCC may not utilize the strategy of direct involvement, instead relying on local organizations that may have a better understanding of the needs of community members. Crutchfield and Grant's fifth factor, which involves mastering the art of adaptation, is also

demonstrated through MCC's ability to effectively analyze situations and respond accordingly. As Crutchfield and Grant state, highly successful nonprofits "have also mastered the ability to listen, learn, and modify their approach in response to external cues—allowing them to sustain their impact and stay relevant."⁹⁶ The existence of MCC's multiple strategies, ranging from direct intervention to facilitation in areas of conflict, illustrates the organization's willingness to respond to external cues in order to provide the most effective form of assistance in a given situation.

In addition, Crutchfield and Grant identify the sixth factor of sharing leadership, and it may be argued that MCC also demonstrates a commitment to this factor. MCC maintains regional offices throughout the United States, as well as offices in Canada and an office in the United Nations, and also places volunteers and personnel in various countries on assignments, ensuring that the organization always benefits from multiple perspectives and voices from people in different levels of leadership around the world. There is, however, a second factor listed by Crutchfield and Grant which is not necessarily applicable to MCC. This factor involves utilizing various markets and influencing business practices, building corporate partnerships, and developing earned-income ventures, which are "all ways of leveraging market forces to achieve social change on a grander scale."⁹⁷ In the future, perhaps MCC will pursue this market-oriented path, but then again, perhaps members of the organization would perceive market ventures as in conflict with some of MCC's core values. It remains to be seen whether MCC will become known to a wider audience in the near future. However, despite the fact that MCC does not exhibit this characteristic as it is outlined by Crutchfield and Grant, the organization still demonstrates a great degree of success based on the other criteria listed.

MCC, unlike many other nonprofits, does not offer externally-imposed and, ultimately, temporary solutions. Likewise, MCC recognizes that a nonprofit cannot take a series of formulaic, easy steps to solve large-scale or deeply rooted conflict. Instead, MCC seeks to understand the people and situation of conflict in an area or community in order to provide the most effective assistance. MCC may be directly involved in efforts to solve and prevent conflict or address other needs in an area, and may also act as a mere facilitator by supporting existing organizations, structures, and community efforts. Ultimately, it is MCC's attempt to understand and work with the people in question which empowers the community, leads to an effective analysis of the situation, and eventually results in MCC providing the most appropriate and effective assistance in a given situation.

The case studies included above also suggest a general absence of proselytizing. While MCC may support and work with local churches and faith communities, MCC utilizes specific, non-proselytizing peacebuilding strategies that address a spectrum of needs, from basic factors of survival to effective ways of solving conflict and education and awareness of dire situations. As stated on MCC's website, in every country where the organization operates alongside local churches and organizations, there are three main areas of work. The first is relief, which involves "meeting people's immediate needs for survival during times of crisis, such as a hurricane or war, and working alongside communities to recover," as well as focusing on "helping communities prepare so that damages from future disasters are minimized." The second main area is development, which involves "strengthening people's long-term access to food and water, health care and education," and helping people "find ways to support their families." Finally, the third area of work is loosely termed peace, and involves "teaching conflict transformation and trauma healing skills, supporting peace education, advocating for justice and encouraging people

to work together despite their differences.”⁹⁸ While many similar, faith-based nonprofits focus on the factor of relief, MCC addresses all three factors in order to address a complex web of forms of structural violence. By addressing these various forms of structural violence, MCC’s work contributes to the building of positive peace. MCC may be viewed as belonging to the large parachurch sector of Christian organizations, but for all of the reasons listed above, MCC is divergent from other faith-based nonprofits.

MCC’s work is also necessarily informed by the pacifist beliefs of Anabaptism. As stated above, the organization’s work helps build positive peace, which correlates with the importance of pacifism as outlined by traditional Anabaptist beliefs. While MCC derives its mission statement from the Anabaptist tradition, however, the reimagining of the Anabaptist vision of peace has enabled MCC to translate an old theory of pacifism into a pragmatic strategy relevant to a modern world. In this way, MCC is divergent from the Anabaptist tradition of noninvolvement, choosing instead to include an obvious component of social action. MCC moves beyond the volunteerism demonstrated in many churches and faith-based organizations, even within the Mennonite community in North America, due to this call to social action. As outlined above, and as stated in the organization’s mission statement, MCC focuses on all three factors of relief, development, and peace and justice. Ultimately, all three areas of work are pertinent to the building of positive peace, and it is MCC’s commitment to all three factors that demonstrates the transformation of Anabaptist pacifist ideology into a pragmatic strategy.

Notes

- ¹ R. Anderson, "A Definition of Peace," *Peace & Conflict* 10, no.2 (2004): 102.
- ² *Ibid.*, 103.
- ³ *Ibid.*, 107.
- ⁴ David Cortright, *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 7.
- ⁵ Marc Pilisuk and Michael Nagler, eds., *History and Vitality of Peace Movements*, vol. 1 of *Peace Movements Worldwide* (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2011), xi.
- ⁶ David P. Barash, ed., *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*, 2nd ed. (USA: Oxford University Press, 2009), 147.
- ⁷ Cortright, *Peace*, 7.
- ⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, 9.
- ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 8.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, 8.
- ¹² M. Kurlansky, *Nonviolence: Twenty-five Lessons From the History of a Dangerous Idea* (NY: Modern Library, 2006), 52.
- ¹³ A. Snyder, *From Anabaptist Seed* (Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2007), 9.
- ¹⁴ J. Roth, *Stories: How Mennonites Came to Be* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 2006), 63.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 113.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 75.
- ¹⁷ I. Pennypacker, "The Quaker Origins," *American Speech* 2, no.9 (1927), 398.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 398.
- ¹⁹ Roth, *Stories*, 68.
- ²⁰ Pennypacker, "Quaker Origins," 398.
- ²¹ Kurlansky, *Nonviolence*, 52.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 52.
- ²³ Snyder, *Anabaptist Seed*, 41.
- ²⁴ Roth, *Stories*, 90.
- ²⁵ Snyder, *Anabaptist Seed*, 41.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.
- ²⁷ Roth, *Stories*, 53.
- ²⁸ Pennypacker, "Quaker Origins," 397.
- ²⁹ Roth, *Stories*, 93.
- ³⁰ Mennonite Central Committee, "Our Purpose," *mcc.org*, 2014.
- ³¹ Mennonite Central Committee, "MCC Annual Report," *mcc.org*, 2014.
- ³² *Ibid.*
- ³³ Cynthia Sampson, "Local Assessments of Mennonite Peacebuilding," in *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, eds. Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach (NY: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, 278.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 278.
- ³⁶ G. Patzwald and W. Kostlevy, "From Mutual Aid to Global Action," *Christian History and Biography*, no. 84 (2004), 36.
- ³⁷ Peachey quoted in Joseph Miller, "Appendix A: Who Are the Mennonites?" in *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, eds. Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach (NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 279.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 279.
- ³⁹ N.L. Gleditsch, G. Nordkvelle, and H. Strand, "Peace Research—Just the Study of War?" *Journal of Peace Research* 51, no.2 (2014), 155.

- ⁴⁰ N. Tomomi, "Faith at Work: Mennonite Beliefs and Occupations," *Ethnology* 47, no.4 (2008), 271.
- ⁴¹ Ibid., 271.
- ⁴² Ibid., 272.
- ⁴³ L. Marr, "The History of Mennonite Central Committee: Developing a Genre," *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 23 (2005), 47.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid., 47.
- ⁴⁵ Ted Koontz quoted in L. Marr, "History of Mennonite," 47.
- ⁴⁶ Quoted in L. Marr, *The Transforming Power of a Century: Mennonite Central Committee and Its Evolution in Ontario* (Kitchener, Ontario: Pandora Press, 2003), 16.
- ⁴⁷ L. Marr, *The Transforming Power*, 17.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., 16.
- ⁴⁹ C.P. Scheitle, *Beyond the Congregation: The World of Christian Nonprofits* (NY: Oxford University Press, 2010), 4.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid., 168.
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 168.
- ⁵² Ibid., 168.
- ⁵³ F. Kniss and D.T. Campbell, "The Effect of Religious Orientation on International Relief and Developmental Organizations," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 36, no.1 (1997), 98.
- ⁵⁴ Ibid., 99.
- ⁵⁵ L.C. Gerstbauer, "The Whole Story of NGO Mandate Change: The Peacebuilding Work of World Vision, Catholic Relief Services, and Mennonite Central Committee," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39, no. 5 (2010), 846.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., 846.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid., 848.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid., 849.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., 859.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., 859.
- ⁶¹ S. Dicklitch and H. Rice, "The Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) and Faith-based NGO Aid to Africa," *Development in Practice* 14, no.5 (2004).
- ⁶² Ibid., 662.
- ⁶³ Quoted in Dicklitch and Rice, "Mennonite Central Committee," 665.
- ⁶⁴ Dicklitch and Rice, "Mennonite Central Committee," 666.
- ⁶⁵ Merry quoted in Dicklitch and Rice, "Mennonite Central Committee," 666.
- ⁶⁶ Dalellew interview quoted in Dicklitch and Rice, "Mennonite Central Committee," 668.
- ⁶⁷ Dicklitch and Rice, "Mennonite Central Committee," 666.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., 666.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., 666.
- ⁷⁰ MCC Workbook 1998, quoted in Dicklitch and Rice, "Mennonite Central Committee," 666.
- ⁷¹ Dicklitch and Rice, "Mennonite Central Committee," 666-667.
- ⁷² Ibid., 667.
- ⁷³ Ibid., 666.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid., 668.
- ⁷⁵ Ibid., 668.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid., 669.
- ⁷⁷ Ibid., 669.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid., 669.
- ⁷⁹ Mark Chupp, "Creating Space for Peace: The Central American Peace Portfolio," in *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, eds. Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach (NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 106.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid., 107.
- ⁸¹ Ibid., 107.
- ⁸² Ibid., 108.

- ⁸³ John Lederach, "Mennonite Central Committee Efforts in Somalia and Somaliland," in *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, eds. Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach (NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 145.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 145.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 145.
- ⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 145.
- ⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 148.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 146-147.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 147-148.
- ⁹⁰ Joseph Liechty, "Mennonites and Conflict in Northern Ireland, 1970-1998," in *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, eds. Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach (NY: Oxford University Press, 2000), 87.
- ⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 87.
- ⁹² *Ibid.*, 87.
- ⁹³ Leslie Crutchfield and Heather McLeod Grant, *Forces for Good: The Six Practices of High-Impact Nonprofits* (CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2012), 37.
- ⁹⁴ Mennonite Central Committee, "Advocacy," *mcc.org*, 2014.
- ⁹⁵ Crutchfield and Grant, *Forces for Good*, 38.
- ⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 38.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 38.
- ⁹⁸ Mennonite Central Committee, "What We Do," *mcc.org*, 2014.

Bibliography

- Anderson, R. "A Definition of Peace." *Peace & Conflict* 10, no. 2 (2004): 101-116.
- Barash, David P., ed. *Approaches to Peace: A Reader in Peace Studies*. 2nd ed. USA: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Chupp, Mark. "Creating Space for Peace: The Central American Peace Portfolio." In *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, edited by Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach. NY: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Cortright, David. *Peace: A History of Movements and Ideas*. NY: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Dicklitch, S. and H. Rice. "The Mennonite Central Committee (MCC) and Faith-based NGO Aid to Africa." *Development in Practice* 14, no. 5 (2004): 660-672.
- Gerstbauer, L.C. "The Whole Story of NGO Mandate Change: The Peacebuilding Work of World Vision, Catholic Relief Services, and Mennonite Central Committee." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39, no.5 (2010): 844-865.
- Gleditsch, N.L., J. Nodkvelle and H. Strand. "Peace Research—Just the Study of War?" *Journal of Peace Research* 51, no.2 (2014): 145-158.
- Kniss, F. and D.T. Campbell. "The Effect of Religious Orientation on International Relief and Development Organizations." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 36, no.1 (1997): 93-103.
- Kurlansky, M. *Nonviolence: Twenty-five Lessons From the History of a Dangerous Idea*. NY: Modern Library, 2006.
- Lederach, John. "Mennonite Central Committee Efforts in Somalia and Somaliland." In *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, edited by Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach. NY: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Liechty, Joseph. "Mennonites and Conflict in Northern Ireland, 1970-1998." In *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, edited by Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach. NY: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Marr, L. "The History of Mennonite Central Committee: Developing a Genre." *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 23 (2005): 47-58.
- Marr, L. *The Transforming Power of a Century: Mennonite Central Committee and Its Evolution In Ontario*. Kitchener, Ontario: Pandora Press, 2003.
- Mennonite Central Committee. "Advocacy." *mcc.org*. 2014.
- _____. "MCC Annual Report." *mcc.org*. 2014.

_____. “Our Purpose.” *mcc.org*. 2014.

_____. “What We Do.” *mcc.org*. 2014.

Miller, Joseph. “Appendix A: Who Are the Mennonites?” In *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, edited by Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach. NY: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Patzwald, G. and W. Kostlevy. “From Mutual Aid to Global Action.” *Christian History & Biography*, no. 84 (2004): 34-36.

Pennypacker, I. “The Quaker Origins.” *American Speech* 2, no.9 (1927): 395-402.

Pilisuk, Marc and Michael Nagler, eds. *History and Vitality of Peace Movements*. Vol. 1 of *Peace Movements Worldwide*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2011.

Roth, J. *Stories: How Mennonites Came to Be*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 2006.

Sampson, Cynthia. “Local Assessments of Mennonite Peacebuilding.” In *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*, edited by Cynthia Sampson and John Lederach. NY: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Scheitle, C.P. *Beyond the Congregation: The World of Christian Nonprofits*. NY: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Snyder, A. *From Anabaptist Seed*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books, 2007.

Tomomi, N. “Faith at Work: Mennonite Beliefs and Occupations.” *Ethnology* 47, no.4 (2008): 271-289.